



FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/680,751 10/06/2000 Dan Matheson 4079.05SU1 2132 22879 7590 11/03/2004 **EXAMINER HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY** BAHTA, KIDEST P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

2125
DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Application	No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/680,751		MATHESON, DAN		
		Examiner	-	Art Unit		
		Kidest Bahta		2125		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2004.					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non	ı-final.			
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
5) <u></u> 6)⊠						
Applicati	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachmen	' '					
1) Notice Notice Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC	4) 0-948)) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da			
3) 🛛 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT r No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/31/2003</u> .	TO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal P) Other:		O-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/680,751 Page 2

Art Unit: 2125

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-6, 10-14, 18 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sebastian et al. (U. S. Patent 5,822,206).

Regarding claims 1-6, 10-14, 18 and 20, Sebastian discloses an object model for capturing information related to product innovation-related data, comprising: a product idea interface for capturing an idea for a product in a product idea object (Fig. 6), a design alternative interface for capturing a plurality of design alternatives for the product in a plurality of respective design alternative object (column 5, lines 22-28); a product requirement interface for capturing a requirement for the product idea in a product requirement object (column 6, lines 45-49; step 42); a product function fulfillment interface which captures how well the product function fulfills the product requirement (column 8, lines 54-65); a design representation interface for capturing a representation of the design alternative in a design representation object (column 15, lines 4-14); a decision interface for capturing a decision in a product requirement object, the decision relating to one of the product idea or the design alternative (column 5, lines 34-49); storing each of the product ides object, the design alternative object, the product requirement object, and the design representation object in a separate relational database, wherein associations between each of the product idea object, the design

22, lines 54-64).

alternative object, the product requirement object, and the design representation object are captures using foreign Keys (column 13, lines 57-67 and table 1); a requirement fulfillment interface for facilitating queries related to levels of fulfillment of requirement encapsulated in the product requirement objects by alternative designs encapsulated in the design alternative objects (column 16, lines 5-15; Fig. 3, steps 42-50 and 58); the product requirement objects encapsulate priority information and said requirement fulfillment interface processes the priority information to facilitate the queries (column 16, lines 29-38); a product requirement decision interface for storing and retrieving information associated with decisions related to requirement encapsulated within the product requirement objects (column 10, limes 24-37; column 17, lines 22-29; column

Page 3

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 7-9, 15-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebastian et al. (U. S. Patent 5,822,206) in view of Malaugh et al. (U.S. Patent 6,445,974).

Regarding claims 7-9, 15-17 and 19, Sebastian discloses the limitations of claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 13 and 18 as stated above in par. 2. However, Sebastian fails to disclose the limitations of claims 7-9, 15-17, and 19.

Application/Control Number: 09/680,751

Art Unit: 2125

Malaugh discloses each to the product idea object, design alternative object, the product requirement object and design representation object are store in a tool-neutral persistent form (column 2, lines 58-67, column 4, lines 12-22 and column 3, lines 44-49).

It would have been obvious to a person of the ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of Sebastian with the teachings of Malaugh because it would provide with an improved system wherein even when a plurality of different electric CAD system are used, part selection data standardizes using a common platform is obtained and even when the individual department require information in different formats due to their different roles, information suitable for each department can be efficiently acquired.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed June 6, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independents claims 1, 10, 18 and 21, Applicant argues Sebastian fails to disclose that "design alternative object". However, Examiner disagrees sine Sebastian discloses that alternative in the design process (column 8, lines 14-30, column 10, lines 10-23; column 16, lines 46-57). In addition, Applicant argues Sebastian fails to disclose "a requirements fulfillment interface". However, Examiner disagrees sine Sebastian discloses a requirements fulfillment interface (column 16, lines 5-15; Fig. 1 and Fig. 3, step 50 and 58; i.e., If these trials meet with approval (step 58), then a detailed tool design is made (step 60)).

Art Unit: 2125

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning communication or earlier communication from examiner should be directed to Kidest Bahta, whose telephone number is (571) 271-3737 Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. EST. If attempts to reach examiner by phone fail, examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached (571) 271-3749. Additionally, fax phones for Art Unit 2125 is (703) 746-7239. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to status of this application should be directed to group receptionist at (703) 305-9600.

Kidest Bahta

October 29,2004